



AS HISTORY 7041/1H

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Component 1H Autocracy, Reform and Revolution: Russia, 1855–1917

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 1 / 1 H / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of Russia in the years 1905 to 1914?

[25 marks]*Target: AO3*

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretations/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- this extract puts forward the overall interpretation that the years 1905 to 1914 were positive years of advance
- it suggests that the 1905 revolution produced beneficial change, that Dumas were moderate and that a constitutional government brought new freedoms and heralded a period of political calm between 1907 and 1914
- it suggests that alongside political developments came renewed modernisation, industrialisation, agricultural improvement and a period of cultural creativity.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- in support of interpretation: evidence of reforms: Stolypin's agricultural reforms improving the status of peasantry; educational reform; introduction workers' insurance
- evidence of moderation and 'political calm': Dumas' failure to adopt radical measures and maintain opposition; Stolypin's restoration of order in the countryside; the more submissive Third and Fourth Dumas following new electoral arrangements
- evidence to support 'growth': industrial developments making Russia the 5th largest industrial power, 1914; cultural creativity, eg work of Stravinsky, Diaghilev, Chagall
- to challenge the interpretation: reforms were limited in practice and constitutionalism failed to develop; the first 2 Dumas were not entirely moderate; overall, positive changes were undermined by the attitude of the Tsar and his ministers.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- overall, this extract suggests that the years 1905–1914 were years of dissatisfaction with no positive change or meaningful reform
- it suggests that the Dumas did not live up to expectations and that muddled and backward-looking thinking dominated government
- the extract also argues that other incidents (such as the Lena massacre, Rasputin and curbs on individuals at universities) were responsible for making the regime seem weak.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- in support of the interpretation: evidence illustrating the limitation of change and reforms; limitations of the new constitution; incomplete agricultural change; disputes over local government reform
- evidence of Duma failure: the collapse of the first 2 Dumas; the manipulation of elections; the work and attitudes of Stolypin and Kolovtsov
- evidence from the Lena goldfields massacre and other strike activity; details of Rasputin's influence and effect; curbs on education

- to challenge the interpretation: evidence of progress and contentment, eg growing prosperity of kulaks; the 1913 Tercentenary celebrations; also examples of firm control from Stolypin and in reaction to strikes.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might suggest that both passages present overly one-sided views. It could be argued that Extract A is the more convincing since it acknowledges the changes that undoubtedly did occur. However, it is possible to argue that Extract B is the more convincing because it is more realistic about the limitations of constitutionalism and the reforms and acknowledges Russia's weakness at the centre. Reward any substantiated judgement.

Section B

0 2 'Tsar Alexander II's reforms failed to change Russia significantly in the years 1861 to 1894.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Tsar Alexander II's reforms failed to change Russia significantly in the years 1861 to 1894 might include:

- examples of continuity and restricted progress despite emancipation of serfs: small peasant holdings, subsistence farming, traditional farming methods; redemption payments; continued bankruptcies; limitations of military reform: wealthy evaded conscription; officer class remained aristocratic; problems of supply and leadership continued (seen in Russo-Turkish war 1877/78)
- local government reform limited: zemstva had no power of taxation; continued dominance of nobility/provincial governors who could overturn decisions; powers restricted further by Alexander III with Land Captains; no democracy
- despite Judiciary reforms: political crimes exempt from new procedures; police strengthened in Alexander II's later years and under Alexander III who also increased powers of Ministry of Justice, raised qualifications for jurors, put peasants' volost courts under Land Captains
- little change despite educational reform: these were largely retracted in Alexander II's later years and under Alexander III; press censorship relaxed but then tightened from 1882; Church reform and reform in condition of Jews and ethnic minorities abandoned under Alexander III's Russification.

Arguments challenging the view that Tsar Alexander II's reforms failed to change Russia significantly in the years 1861 to 1894 might include:

- emancipation of serfs: gave former-serfs free status and aided beginnings of kulak class; more mobility allowed beginnings of industrial workforce; some landowners redeemed debts and invested in industry; peasants' lot improved, especially after redemption fees reduced, 1881 and Poll Tax cancelled, 1885; Military reform: gave greater equality – conscription for all classes, reduced length of service, less severe punishments, end of military colonies, better education/medical provision, modern weaponry, military colleges for officers
- local government reform: brought 'professional classes' into government; provoked more political debate; brought improvement in public services
- judiciary reforms: a single system of courts with equality before the law; significantly – accused deemed innocent until proven guilty; lawyers and juries for criminal cases; trained judges; JPs; open hearings; right of appeal to higher courts; despite some curbs, this continued under Alexander III
- educational reform: provision expanded (particularly at primary level) and literacy rates improved; some corruption in Church addressed; beginnings of a more 'modern' society.

Alexander II's reforms certainly altered Russia's political, military and social structure and better answers might well challenge the assumption of failure and deem the reforms to be of considerable significance. However, many of the reforms were restricted in scope and some of the effects (eg of emancipation) were not to be felt until well after 1894. It is therefore fair to say that there was also a good deal of continuity throughout this period, which was reinforced by curbs on the reforms in Alexander II's later years and by Alexander III. It could even be argued that, since the reforms had not been fully carried through by 1894, they were of limited significance, given the continued dominance of the noble class and a traditional peasant society.

0 3 'Russian industry and agriculture were transformed in the years 1881 to c1900.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**

Nothing worthy of credit.

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Russian industry and agriculture were transformed in the years 1881 to c1900:

- industrialisation was driven by the state under Vyshnegradsky and Witte; protective tariffs foreign loans; grain export drive; increased movement from land to industry
- 'Great Spurt' in 1890s: expansion of factory production with use of foreign workers, managers and engineers to oversee and advise on industrial planning/techniques
- vastly expanded railway network (doubled in length under Witte); improved access to raw materials; improved infrastructure; by 1892 budget in surplus; overall growth rate of over 8% pa from 1894; by 1897 – 4th largest industrial economy
- land banks for peasants (1883) and nobles (1885) facilitated land purchase for more efficient farming; growth of kulak class farming more profitably; improvements in output in 1880s; state-sponsored emigration to develop Siberia from 1896.

Arguments challenging the view that Russian industry and agriculture were transformed in the years 1881 to c1900:

- factory-production restricted to major towns and centres, particularly in Western Russia, and to heavy industries – especially coal, metal and oil; traditional lighter industries, eg textiles remained more important; much of country had little industry other than handicrafts; much industry small-scale domestic
- railway trackage limited compared to size of country; travel burdensome and slow; aspects of infrastructure, eg banking under-developed
- agriculture still dominant suggesting an undeveloped economy; farming predominantly small-scale, limited by mir, redemption dues and taxation; grain production inefficient and yields low compared to western Europe and USA
- industry dependent on exported grain and the extortion from peasants was unsustainable; famine of 1891–2 showed peasants had too little land to prosper.

The Russian economy certainly changed considerably as a result of state-sponsored industrial growth, particularly in the 1890s and it could be argued that this change was sufficient to warrant these years representing a 'transformation'. However, the limitations on that growth and, in particular, the dominance of an inefficient agricultural sector means that it is probably an exaggeration to talk of a complete transformation between 1881 and c1900.